



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1480
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/738,786

12/15/2000

Kevin McCombe

40101/01101

3798

30636

7590

06/08/2006

FAY KAPLUN & MARCIN, LLP
150 BROADWAY, SUITE 702
NEW YORK, NY 10038

EXAMINER

BAROT, BHARAT

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 06/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

1. Claims 1-11 remain for further examination. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1-11 filed on March 17, 2006 have been fully considered.

The old rejection maintained

2. The rejection is respectfully maintained as set forth in the last Office Action mailed on December 27, 2005. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1-11 have been fully considered but they are deemed to be moot and old rejection maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103(a)

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morwood (U.S. Patent No. 6,470,346) in view of Peters et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,385,637).

5. As to claim 1, Morwood disclose a system for managing a plurality of client processes (see abstract; figures 1-2; and column 2 lines 33-67), comprising: a client task within which the client processes will be executed (column 1 lines 50-63; column 2 lines 33-67; and column 14 line 64 to column 15 line 52); and a manager task running at a higher priority than the client task, the manager task queuing the client processes into the client task in priority order (figures 2-3; column 4 lines 15-22; and column 8 line 16 to column 9 line 28).

However, Morwood does not explicitly disclose that the manager task kills the client task when a current one of the client processes is not completed within a predetermined time period.

Peters et al explicitly discloses that the manager task kills the client task when a current one of the client processes is not completed within a predetermined time period (see abstract; figure 2; column 1 lines 32-53; column 7 line 57 to column 8 line 8; column 8 lines 42-60; column 9 lines 5-26; and column 10 line 50 to column 11 line 16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Peters et al as stated above with the system of Morwood for managing a plurality of client processes because it would have provided a novel timing method and apparatus to manage the plurality of client processes and control network communication traffic, maximized network latency, and reduced or eliminated time delay.

6. As to claims 2-3, Morwood disclose that the manager task restarts the client task and queues a next one of the client processes into the client task or requeues the current client process into the client task (figures 3, 11, and 14; column 9 lines 9-21; column 12 lines 16-37; and column 13 lines 24-47).

7. As to claims 4-5, Morwood disclose that the client task sends a response to the manager task indicating the execution of the current client process is complete; and the manager task, when receiving the response from the client task, queues a next one of the client processes into the client task (column 9 lines 4-21; column 10 lines 51-64; and column 12 lines 6-37).

8. As to claims 6-10, they are also rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claims 1-5 above, since claims 6-10 are merely a method of operation for the apparatus defined in the claims 1-5.

9. As to claim 11, it is also rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claim 1 above, since claim 11 is merely a computer-readable storage medium storing a set of instructions to manage the apparatus defined in the claim 1.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 filed on March 17, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive for the claims 1-11.

11. In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

(A) Argument: Peters patent does not teach a process to execute and if the process does not execute, that process is killed (There is no mention in the Peter patent of killing a task); therefore, the Peters patent is not concerned with "a manager task kills the client task when a current one of the client processes is not completed within a predetermined time period," as recited in claim 1.

Response: The argument toward Peters patent is not persuasive because Peters explicitly discloses that a process to execute and if the process does not execute, that process is killed (column 7 line 57 to column 8 line 8; and column 8 lines 42-60); and also discloses that a manager task kills the client task when a current one of the client processes is not completed within a predetermined time period (figure 2; column 8 lines 42-60; column 9 lines 5-26; and column 10 line 50 to column 11 line 16), which implies the claimed invention, rendering the rejection proper, and rejection stands.

Art Unit: 2155

(B) Argument: Morwood and Peters, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest "a system for managing a plurality of client processes, comprising a manager task...that kills the client task when a current one of the client process is not completed within a predetermined time period," as recited in claim 1.

Response: The argument toward rejection is not persuasive and rejection stands.

Morwood explicitly discloses a system for managing a plurality of client processes (figure 2), a manager process queuing the client processes into a plurality of queues by using priority level, and also inherently discloses a manager process killing the client processes by generating aborted and removed queues (figures 2-3; and column 8 line 28 to column 9 line 28). But Morwood does not explicitly disclose a manager process kills the client process when a current one of the client process is not completed within a predetermined time period. Peters explicitly discloses a supervisory computer terminal kills a selected process when a current one of the selected process is not completed within a predetermined time period (column 9 lines 5-26; and column 10 line 50 to column 11 line 16); therefore, the combination of Morwood and Ferguson explicitly discloses or suggests the claimed limitations of the claim 1.

Art Unit: 2155

12. This action is made final. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Contact Information

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Bharat Barot** whose Telephone Number is **(571) 272-3979**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM. Most facsimile-transmitted patent application related correspondence is required to be sent to the Central FAX Number **(571) 273-8300**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Saleh Najjar**, can be reached at **(571) 272-4006**.

Patent Examiner Bharat Barot

Art Unit 2155

June 02, 2006


BHARAT BAROT
PRIMARY EXAMINER